

Remarks

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 51-56, 58, 60-81, 83 and 85-100 were pending in the above-identified patent application.

Claims 51, 52, 54-56, 60, 61, 68, 69, 71, 76, 77, 79-81, 85, 86, 93, 94, and 96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lawler et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,805,763 ("Lawler"). Claims 53 and 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Lawler in view of Hendricks et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,600,364. Claims 58 and 83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Lawler in view of Mugura U.S. Patent No. 6,518,986 and in further view of Matthews III et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837. Claims 62, 65, 66, 72, 74, 75, 87, 90, 91, 97, 99 and 100 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Lawler in view of Matthews III et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837. Claims 63, 64, 67, 69, 70, 88, 89, 92, 94 and 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Lawler in view of Shoff et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555. Claims 73 and 98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Lawler in view of Lawler et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0160452.

Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended independent claims 51 and 76 to more particularly define the invention. The claim amendments are fully supported by the originally filed specification, and no new matter has been added (*see e.g.*, page 21, lines 1-19 of applicants' originally filed specification). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks that follow

Summary of Telephonic Interview

The Examiner and the undersigned agent of record ("applicants' representative") conducted a telephonic interview on February 17, 2010. Applicants and applicants' representative wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview.

During the interview, the Examiner and applicants' representative discussed the amendments shown in this paper, and the Examiner acknowledged that the amended claims are

patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the § 102 rejection of applicants' amended independent claims 51 and 76 be withdrawn. Since dependent claims 52-56, 58, 60-75, 77-81, 83 and 85-100 depend variously from allowable independent claims 51 and 76, applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 52-56, 58, 60-75, 77-81, 83 and 85-100 are also allowable over the prior art of record. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections of claims 52-56, 58, 60-75, 77-81, 83 and 85-100 be withdrawn as well.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Baaba Andam/

Baaba Andam
Limited Recognition No. L0455
Agent for Applicants
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 75563
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8704
Tel. No.: (212) 596-9000